

1. NJDEP Comment: The BERA Summary (Section 3.2.2) needs to explain why the area around sediment sample location SED007 is not included as an Area of Particular Concern (APC) and to be further evaluated for potential remediation. The FS Report (page 24) states that this sample had the largest mean HQsed of the evaluated sediments; however, this sample was not evaluated for acute toxicity using Hyalella and chironomid bioassays, so the potential for toxicity at this location could not be verified empirically.

Response: Location SED007 was a sediment sample collected from the diffuse channel of Black Brook off the eastern side of the landfill. The definition of an APC is a concentration 3 times greater than the Soil Alternative Remediation Standard (discussed in Appendix A to the FS Report), which does not apply to sediments.

The analytical results from the SED007 area were outliers relative to the other sediment samples collected for the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA). As discussed in the BERA, most of the sediment samples had acceptable results for sediment benchmark comparisons, AVS/SEM assessment, and acute toxicity testing results (see BERA Figure 5-1). There are no sediment toxicity data available for SED007 because the sediments for sediment toxicity were selected based on data from the Remedial Investigation, obtained prior to collecting samples for the BERA. However, as discussed in Section 5.1.2 of the BERA, there were no statistically significant correlations between any of the organic or inorganic constituents of potential ecological concern (COPEC) results or physicochemical parameters (i.e., pH, grain size) with the Hyalella or chironomid growth test results. Thus, exceedance of sediment criteria alone is not a good predictor of toxicity. Given the isolated exceedances for this location, further evaluation of sediment remediation was not needed for the FS.

2. NJDEP Comment: Deed Notices are required to be established on any property where Alternate Remediation Standards (ARSs) are applied. This includes, but is not limited to, the Baseball Field and the Shooting Range properties. The requirement for a deed notice should be discussed in the FS in any section where the application of ARSs is discussed.

Response: References to deed notices have been added in Section 6.2, which discusses the proposed institutional controls.

3. NJDEP Comment: Page 29, Section 4.1 - For completeness, the FS Report needs to state that the calculated ARSs replace both the NRDCSRs and the RDCSRs.

Response: This revision has been made in Section 4.1.

4. NJDEP Comment: Pages 31-32 of the FS Report mention that any future use of ground

water is unlikely. This being the case, the Hunt Club well should be properly abandoned as per NJDEP requirements.

Response: This revision has been made in Sections 7.3 and 7.4.1.

5. NJDEP Comment: NJDEP recommends that the access controls (i.e. fencing) already proposed for the northern boundary of the Miele property be extended along the eastern, southern and western boundaries of the Miele property shared with the Refuge property to restrict access by trespassers and/or recreators. This recommended revision to the fence configuration will provide more reliable access restriction than what would be realized by the proposed reliance on the administratively and legally-undefined "natural barrier " that the surrounding environment and terrain of the swamp may or may not provide. EPA is willing to discuss this request and visit the site to observe conditions.

Response: To be determined based on the site inspection with USEPA and NJDEP on July 26.